

RECEIVED
MAY 29 2009

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held May 7, 2009, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance: Chad Anderson (Arr. 7:20) Chris Anderson Torry Brean (Arr. 7:20)
Matt Deskovick Katherine L. Finley Kathy S. Finley (Arr. 7:20)
Dennis Grimes Bob Hailey Eb Hogervorst
Kristi Mansolf Jim Piva Dennis Sprong
Paul Stykel Angus Tobiason Richard Tomlinson

Chris Anderson, RCPG Chair, acted as the Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

- ITEM 1: The Acting Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:12 p.m.**
- ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance**
- ITEM 3: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present**
- ITEM 4: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – Chad Anderson, Torry Brean and Kathy S. Finley were late.**
- ITEM 5: Approval of Order of the Agenda (Action)**

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Matt Deskovick, the order of the agenda was **approved 12-0-0-0-3**, with no changes, with Chad Anderson, Torry Brean and Kathy S. Finley absent.

- ITEM 6: Roberts Rules of Order – Rules of Parliamentary Procedure to be Followed during Meeting. The Brown Act – General Information on What it is and How it Applies to the RCPG (Chair)**

The Chair said Roberts Rules of Order govern how the RCPG meetings are conducted. The Brown Act defines how the public participates in the meeting.

- ITEM 7: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)**

The Chair announced that there were 2 hiking tours coming up. She asked anyone interested to contact her for details. One hike goes from the Fenton Ranch to the Gildred Ranch in the San Diego River Park.

Ms. Mansolf announced Ed Zielanski of the Capital Improvements Division will be holding a public meeting at the Ramona Community Center at 6 p.m. on May 20, 2009 for the Notice of Preparation for EIR for the San Vicente Road Improvements project.

The Chair announced that May 8, 2009, the Progress Report on the GP Update is on the Planning Commission agenda. The item will go to the Board of Supervisors in June.

The Chair said that there is an intersection issue at Lamar and Walnut. She asked this item be put on the T&T agenda for June 2.

ITEM 8: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 3-5-09 and 4-2-09 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING MARCH 5, 2009.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Matt Deskovick, the Motion passed 15-0-0-0-0.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING APRIL 2, 2009.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Jim Piva, the Motion passed 13-0-2-0-0, with Matt Deskovick and Richard Tomlinson abstaining.

ITEM 9: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized) – None

ITEM 10: AD 09-012 Fasano Oversized Barn at 1104 W. Haverford Rd. Worland, Engineer. Barn to be 15 feet, 4 inches high in a 12 foot Height Limited Area (Discussion and Possible Action)

Mr. Worland, the owner's representative, was in attendance. The height of the building is 3 to 4 feet higher than allowed. The building was reviewed by the Design Review Board in 2008 with photos taken from Hwy 78 that showed the building is hidden at the back of the property and isn't visible from Hwy 78. Mr. Worland's client is retired and elderly. He is a former movie set builder and built the structure. The last Code Enforcement Officer sited him for the carport and discovered the unpermitted structure. There is a 12 foot height limit if the building is 10 feet from the property line. The height of the building is 15 feet. It is taller, too, because it is built on a block wall. When the Design Review Board saw the building plans, the project was a waiver. The administrative permit is required due to the discovery of the height of the building. The building has been there 10 years.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion passed 15-0-0-0-0.

ITEM 11: Road Vacation Request No. 2007-0135, 2nd Street between Main and "D" Street. Request being Handled by the Department of General Services. Thomas Harrington, Contact (w/T&T)

Mr. Harrington said the RCPG reviewed this request in November, 2007, without consensus. This area was carved up on a map 102 years ago when terrain wasn't taken into account. There is a section of 2nd St. shown on a map as connecting with D St. 2nd St. is 120 feet offset to the west and not done at the 60 foot easement. This is not a viable, buildable easement. The County has no future plans to put a road through on this site. No one has thought to put a road here for 102 years.

Mr. Piva said the T&T Subcommittee reviewed the vacation request and approved it unanimously.

MOTION: TO VACATE THE EASEMENT AS SUBMITTED.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Matt Deskovick, the Motion passed 15-0-0-0-0.

ITEM 12: PAA 09-001, Ramona Retail Center. Hwy 67 at Ramona Maria Lane. Presentation by Coast Income Properties, Applicant. 53 Acres. Proposing a Change from Semi Rural 10 (GP Update), Intensive Agriculture 19 (Current) to General Commercial C-1 (GP Update), General Commercial C-36 (Current)

Tom Blake of Coast Income Properties said they want to put in a retail store in Ramona and want the RCPG input. They have recently submitted the Plan Amendment Authorization to the County who reviewed and denied the request. The County did not deny the PAA based on the merits of the project, but determined that the proposal was not consistent with the General Plan Update and the County is almost ready to put the General Plan out for public review. They can appeal the decision or may withdraw the PAA. Coast Income Properties wants to work with the community to find the best location for a retail facility. They want to search over the next month for a location and asked that a committee be formed to look at locations to see if they can find an alternative site. They want about 53 acres with about 43 of it usable. They need at least 35 acres. A Target alone would need 13 to 15 acres alone. Retail has synergism. They are looking for a site with frontage where they can offer one-stop opportunities. A site with less than 25 thousand trips per day won't work. They also need a seller. They will look for a month. If they can't find a site, they will ask the community if a retail center is enough of a benefit to be put by Rancho Maria Lane. Would the RCPG help with formation of a subcommittee to look for a location?

Mr. Sprong asked if redevelopment was an option?

Mr. Blake said there is a 10 year process for redevelopment and it is up to the County. This won't work for them now.

Mr. Brean said that down 10th St./San Vicente could be a possible location. He would like to see development going into this area.

The Chair said the RCPG voted in January or February to have 3rd to Etcheverry be the Commercial area. When 80 percent of build-out is achieved, commercial development should be fatter rather than longer.

Mr. Piva asked if Mr. Blake had signed with Target?

Mr. Blake said Target has not signed.

Mr. Piva said this is misleading. He knows they have secured rights. We all know each other. If we are working with the community, the price may be higher. We'll all know. The price may double. Ag land can be purchased at ag prices. But if the seller knows the land is to be used for commercial development, the price would be adjusted.

Mr. Blake said secret is not their way. They want to engage us in the process.

Speaker: Liz Massey, Ramona Resident

Ms. Massey is in favor of the Ramona Retail Center. She has been a resident of Ramona for 22 years. As Ramona grows, there will be more families and more retirees. People's needs grow. We need variety. Something like a Target would give us choices and provide jobs. There will be nice restaurants. She doesn't feel this development will hurt Ramona. When the UPS Store came into town, it didn't put the USPS out of business. We could have a movie theater and a book store. No businesses will suffer and shut down. Ms. Massey said the Ramona Retail Center is about catering to needs and what people want. Are we providing what people want now?

Speaker: Pat Kiernan, Ramona Resident

Mr. Kiernan feels this is a big decision for Ramona and he asked the RCPG to think it through. If the Ramona Retail Center is put where it is proposed for on Hwy 67, there will be more traffic and more stoplights. Businesses will be affected. Some people followed the rules and built in the Commercial zone. A 35 acre big box center is better than a 53 acre big box center. He lives on Susie Way. Development here would probably help him. He doesn't think it is a good idea. Now there are cows and the welcome sign. Putting a big box development at the west end of Town would take the face off Ramona. If we plan properly, it will benefit Ramona now and in 20 years.

Speaker: Norma Kiernan, Ramona Resident

Ms. Kiernan grew up in Poway when it was rural. She works in a redevelopment office. She moved to Ramona. When driving home, past Cloudy Moon Drive, she has peace on her shoulders. She would like to have a Henry's and a real Starbucks where you can sit down, but she doesn't want Ramona to become Carmel Mountain.

Speaker: Doug Oliver, Ramona Resident

Mr. Oliver moved to Ramona in 1991. He needed horses and property. If he wants a big box store, he goes to a big box store. Ramona is a village. A 35 to 50 acre big box store doesn't fit in a village. He has a business in Ramona. K-Mart barely is surviving. Sears does a great job. There is work being done on the Town Center now. He asked people to watch the movie "A Christmas Gift" which is a similar story.

Mr. Blake would like to see a committee formed to see if their project will work here.

The Chair said the denial of the PAA is not specific to the project. A committee can be formed to get the ideas of 4 groups whose purview this issue falls under. She will make the contacts with these groups.

MOTION: THE RCPG SUPPORTS THE FORMATION OF A COMMITTEE TO REVIEW EXPLORATORY SITE SELECTION FOR THE RAMONA RETAIL CENTER, IF FORMED.

(Discussion on the Motion)

Mr. Deskovick said that he is okay with however this will be done. He doesn't want commercial built out of our Commercial district. Promoting business is not a bad idea.

Mr. Tobiason said the site on the west end of Ramona may be okay for commercial. The steepness of the area by Rancho Maria Lane will require a lot of grading. The Business District is pinched by

the schools and the Creek. If there is no area that is 35 acres in Ramona immediately, he would look for a leveler spot.

Mr. Grimes said capitalism made America great. He is concerned with restrictions each day. Ag land is limited, slowly disappearing. The views and vistas are important and make Ramona special. There is commercial land here already that can be used. Dodge the vernal pools. He does not want to see a gigantic retail center on ag land.

Mr. Stykel asked if car counts had been done?

Mr. Blake said that some had been done in front of the site.

Mr. Stykel said there are 2 arteries in Ramona – Hwy 67 and Hwy 78. There is also the SDCE. He doesn't know how we can help unless we know the car counts.

Mr. Blake said the committee formed will look at large aerial maps.

Mr. Anderson asked if the assembling of small parcels was an option?

Mr. Blake has no experience with this.

Mr. Anderson said there are eucalyptus trees and vernal pools are on Main St. We can work to get what is needed.

Mr. Blake said it is hard to get 6 to 10 property owners to agree. A redevelopment agency would have to be formed.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley asked if there is no other site, does this give DPLU the choice to say it goes on the west side of town because there are no other options? If we take this action, does it show our support for DPLU putting it there?

The Chair said she doesn't believe this would be the case.

(Voting on the Motion)

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 13-2-0-0-0**, with Katherine L. Finley and Dennis Grimes voting no.

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0**.

ITEM 13: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

13-A: SOUTH (Hailey) (No Business)

13-B: WEST (Mansolf) (Action Items)

13-B-1: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for Montecito Road SC 931, General Plan Amendment; PWA-00199. Amendment to Circulation Element of San Diego County General Plan to Remove a Segment of Montecito Road

Starting Approximately 1000 feet West of Montecito Way and Continuing West Approximately 8,700 feet (1.65) Miles to Rangeland Road. Available at: <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/environment/envrnsvcs.html> (w/T&T)

Ms. Mansolf read the project description and gave the West Subcommittee report. The RCPG recommended vacating the extension of Montecito Road through the Airport in June of 2006 and in April, 2009. This item has been recently before the RCPG and T&T Subcommittees. The item on the agenda is the environmental document for the Montecito Road General Plan Amendment. For vacating the road, the County is looking into the possibility of making a public emergency evacuation road north of the Airport that will be gated. West Subcommittee members wanted a sound plan in place for an alternative road before vacating Montecito Road. They don't believe Ramona will get an emergency evacuation road if Montecito Road vacated. Ms. Mansolf felt the County has demonstrated commitment for the emergency evacuation road, which may also be used as a trail. It is being investigated now. The Subcommittee made a motion to deny the negative declaration until such time as the County provides a viable emergency access road. A map was provided to each RCPG member.

Mr. Piva said the T&T Subcommittee wasn't sure why the item was on their agenda again since it had been on the agenda the previous month. The Subcommittee didn't have a project map. Discussion at the T&T Subcommittee was on where the gate would go and if businesses would be affected. They still support the previous action.

Mr. Piva said there have been meetings with the County. The plan is proceeding. He saw the road. Discussions have been opened with the wildlife agencies. The road would be an emergency access road Montecito Way to Rangeland Road.

Mr. Grimes asked if this was in writing?

The Chair said the Fire Department signed off on the concept. The County included us at the table. Devon Muto, head of the GP Update, was at the meetings.

Mr. Piva feels some of the people on the T&T Subcommittee are trying to keep this issue open for a real road. We need a real road.

The Chair said we want a northern road.

Mr. Tobiason said that we begged for a northern bypass out to Mt. Woodson. Montecito Road was on the map before the County extended the airport runway. One quarter of the population would use a good road to avoid a fiasco at Dye Road. We need roads. At the last T&T meeting, many tops of County departments came. They have a desperate need for this road to be vacated. 8,700 feet of a potential roadway extends to Rangeland for Montecito Road. If the RCPG members vote for eliminating this road, it will be difficult to get elected again.

Mr. Brean said there have been huge trust violations when working with agencies. The road was on paper in the recent past. What can we do to get the best road possible? Why trade off a road without some quality product? He would vote to vacate the road if in a few weeks this road issue would be resolved.

The Chair discussed the motions from an RCPG meeting in June, 2006, where the RCPG voted on the Circulation Element for the GP Update that included Montecito Road and segments of the SA 603.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley said the Montecito Road connection has been on the books a long time. The RCPG has changed.

Ms. Mansolf said the County has opened discussions with the wildlife agencies on putting an emergency evacuation road north of the Ramona Airport. Mitigation may be required for making a gated road through the Park. The access road can be used for a trail. The County is waiting to hear back from the wildlife agencies to see what can be done and what mitigation will be required. The Fire Department supports the concept.

Mr. Hailey said we vacated a dotted line on a runway. The road was on the runway. We would never use this road. We need a circulation element road in that area.

Mr. Thomas Harrington, Department of General Services, addressed the RCPG. The RCPG is rehashing the same issues. The RCPG voted to vacate the road in 2006 and 2009. The County fielded Department leaders to address our concerns. The Parks Department prepared a written handout. The RCPG rang the bell and the County listened. Devon Muto knows we need a road. Tonight the County wants our input on the Negative Declaration. The type of input the County is looking for is to see if this environmental document is adequate, or is a full EIR required. What is to be considered is any environmental impacts due to removing the lines on a map.

Mr. Grimes is concerned with not having anything in writing.

Mr. Harrington said we aren't there yet. A gate is not proposed with the Negative Declaration. The Negative Declaration is just about removing the road. 8,000 feet is coming off, and the western one-half mile will be fenced. There are no plans for emergency access on this road. The fire access road is coming along. As far as the gate, the RCPG will see a site plan for the Airport improvements in the future.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

Upon motion made Bob Hailey and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion passed 13-2-0-0-0, with Katherine L. Finley and Angus Tobiason voting no.

13-B-2. Draft Landscape Ordinance (POD 08-016) Proposed Amendment will Establish a Landscape Water Budget and Water Use Authorization, the Submittal of Landscape and Irrigation Plans Demonstrating Adherence to the Water Budget, Installation of Water Submeters to Assist in Monitoring Landscape Water Use, a Requirement to Use Recycled Water for Irrigation if Available, and Enforcement Capability

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. It was reported the CWA has sent out a Level II Drought Alert. There will be an 8 percent cutback to the RMWD from the CWA from last year. If you installed a new watering system last year that cut your water usage 20 percent, you are still going to be required to cut back another 8 percent starting this year.

Ms. Mansolf said the County's Draft Landscape Ordinance public review period ends May 4, but the County said they will still accept the RCPG comments from the May 7 meeting. The County Ordinance is intended to reflect State law and new, more stringent requirements on water usage. The Ordinance applies to new development and additions of water features to existing development that are 50 sq ft or greater (like a swimming pool).

According to RMWD Director, George Boggs, there is no recycled water in Ramona. There is tertiary treated water at the San Vicente Golf Course, in Highland Valley, Spangler Ranch and the Mt. Woodson Golf Course

Comments:

- A financial impact statement should be included in the ordinance.
- Five new permits will be required just for landscaping and water usage. These permits will be very costly. Five permits is excessive.
- Five different professionals, such as licensed civil engineers and landscape architects will have to be hired to get the job done. This will be very costly. Hiring five separate engineers/professionals is excessive
- There are concerns with the County's right to inspect clause.
- There is no discussion about the interface between water districts.
- There is redundancy between the County requirements, the State requirements, and what the RMWD will be requiring when they write their Ordinance in keeping with the law.
- There is redundancy between permit requirements that are already in place, such as grading permits and the Draft Landscape Ordinance.

The cost will add significantly to the high cost already to develop in the County. A motion was made to send comments.

Mr. Grimes said that the Draft Landscape Ordinance would be an onerous burden. A grading permit is already required to build a house. There will be sprinkler timers. The State Ordinance doesn't required submeters, but the County does. With submeters, a pipe separation has to be maintained. Mr. Grimes researched the item and wrote comments for the RCPG to consider sending.

Speaker: George Boggs, Ramona Resident

Mr. Boggs submitted comments for the record. Mr. Boggs said the RMWD has to come up with their owner Ordinance.

MOTION: BASED ON THE ITEMS CONTAINED IN THIS DOCUMENT, AT THIS TIME WE CANNOT SUPPORT THE DRAFT LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE. TO SEND COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE AS SUBMITTED.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion passed 15-0-0-0-0.

13-C: EAST (Kathy S. Finley)(No Business)

13-D: PARKS (Tomlinson) (Action Items)

Mr. Tomlinson said he had a Subcommittee meeting but did not have a quorum. He talked to the applicant about the PLDO project and will be having a meeting in the near future.

MOTION: TO TABLE UNTIL NEXT MONTH.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion passed 14-0-0-0-1, with Matt Deskovick absent.

13-D-1: PLDO Project – Lighting at Pony Baseball Field. Consideration of Placement on Ramona PLDO Project List

13-E: AHOPE (Grimes) (Action Item)

13-E-1: Review, discussion, and action on DPLU Staff comments to Ramona Community Plan regarding AHOPE purview items. (w/GP Update, Parks, and T&T)

Mr. Grimes discussed the GP Update at the AHOPE Subcommittee meeting. An appendix for biology and other resources had been requested by the RCPG. The County asked what we want to include in the appendix. A list has been made for the appendix. Mr. Grimes said the County also wanted to know what definition of open space the RCPG wanted to use. Mr. Grimes came up with the following definition: An area that is valued for natural processes and wildlife, for agricultural or woodland production, for active and passive recreation, and/or for providing other public benefits. AHOPE supported prior AHOPE recommendations for the appendix to the Ramona Community Plan and for the Conservation Element, to establish a user friendly format and a complete reference document that people can purchase, rather than dispersing the information into other documents that make reference difficult.

AHOPE comments on the GP Update will go to the GP Update Subcommittee.

Mr. Sprong asked about open space.

The Chair said open space is a tool. There are many types of open space. Ag is one type. Ramona has prime ag land. These should be used for ag. Open space only applies to property being split or included in open space.

(Mr. Deskovick left at 9:30)

13-F: GP Update Plan (Anderson) (Action Item)

13-F-1: GP Update, Ramona Community Plan Document. Staff Recommendations and Policies (w/Parks, AHOPE, and T&T)

13-F-2: Report on Steering and Interest Group Meetings, Conservation Subdivisions, GP Update (Chair)

The Chair went to the Interest Group meeting May 1 and the Steering Committee meeting May 2. Both groups are finding flaws with the work of the County, but from different perspectives. Decoupling was discussed. As concerns minimum lot size, the Interest Group doesn't want this. The Planning Commission says having a minimum lot size will change the look. There was discussion on the Interest Group meeting with the Steering Committee to see what they agree on, disagree on, and can't decide on. There was a 12-4 vote that they meet.

The Chair gave an example of a conservation subdivision. If there are 100 acres and it is 100 percent constrained, 25 acres can be developed.

The Interest Group discussed mitigation land. Now mitigation doesn't have to be bought in the same community where the mitigation is needed. Ramona has no mitigation banks, so no

mitigation occurs here. The Steering Committee wants to see mitigation land purchased in the same community where the mitigation is required.

Fuel management was discussed – this land counts as usable land and not as open space.

The Interest Group felt the Resource Protection Ordinance mitigates and sets forth the rules to cover resources. More requirements are not needed. There are new global warning requirements.

The Chair said the County Draft Public Road Standards went to the Planning Commission. There was an impasse on curb, gutter and sidewalks. The County wants to put these everywhere, including in rural communities. A committee is being formed to look at the Public Road Standards. The Chair asked that Ramona have representation on this subcommittee and Mr. Woods agreed for Ramona to have a spot. She is recommending that Jim Piva sit on this committee, and Frank Coakley of the T&T Subcommittee be his alternate.

Mr. Piva said that Mr. Coakley works to put in roads with the County and CalTrans and so is highly qualified to be his alternate.

The Chair said \$40 million was spent on roads in Valley Center. We don't want that look here.

MOTION: TO SUPPORT JIM PIVA AND FRANK COAKLEY TO BE REPRESENTATIVES ON THE PUBLIC ROAD STANDARDS COMMITTEE THROUGH THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Matt Deskovick absent.

13-G: CUDA (Brean)(Action Item)

13-G-1:TPM 21160. 385 Creelman Ln. Proposal to subdivide a 9.46 Acre Parcel into 2, 4 Acre Parcels. Johnson, Owner (w/T&T)

The project engineer, Jim Grabarczyk, said the previous code enforcement officer sited the owner for having 2 homes on the property and no permit for the 2nd house. Family live in the 2nd house. The Johnsons want the issue resolved, and so are doing a lot split.

CUDA had some concerns with the shape of the lot, which has a panhandle connection to Creelman.

Mr. Grabarczyk said there are leach fields under the panhandle.

Mr. Hailey said it looks like they are setting up for a future lot split with the access off Creelman. Access could be off Wilson.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT ALONG WITH THE STATED CONCERN OVER THE USE OF THE PANHANDLE CONNECTION TO CREELMAN.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 14-0-0-0-1**, with Matt Deskovick absent.

13-H: Transportation/Trails (Piva)(Action Items)

13-H-1:Road Vacation Request No. 2007-0135, 2nd Street between Main and

**“D” Street. Request being Handled by the Department of General Services.
Thomas Harrington, Contact (at top of the agenda)**

**13-H-2:TPM 21160. 385 Creelman Ln. Proposal to subdivide a 9.46
Acre Parcel into 2, 4 Acre Parcels. Johnson, Owner (w/CUDA)**

**13-H-3:Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for Montecito Road SC 931,
General Plan Amendment; PWA-00199. Amendment to Circulation Element
of San Diego County General Plan to Remove a Segment of Montecito Road
Starting Approximately 1000 feet West of Montecito Way and Continuing
West Approximately 8,700 feet (1.65) Miles to Rangeland Road. Available at:
<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/environment/envrnsves.html> (w/West)**

**13-H-4:Dye Rd. Extension Project – a Capital Improvement Project. Notice of
Preparation of EIR Was Released for Public Review 4-2-09 with Public
Comments Due 5-4-09**

Mr. Piva said that Ed Zielanski gave a report at the T&T Subcommittee of the public meeting April 15 and presented the project, which will smooth out the sharp curves on Dye to San Vicente. Donna Myers was the only member of the RCPG or T&T Subcommittee at the meeting.

Speaker: Joe Minervini, Ramona Resident

Mr. Minervini doesn't think we need a Main St. bypass to bypass the empty buildings on Main St. Mr. Minervini lives on Cecelia Jo by Mussey Grade. He doesn't want to see a grade separator on Mussey Grade. He feels we don't need a bypass. Synchronization of traffic signals would help with traffic.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers said the Notice of Preparation for EIR was released on April 2, 2009. On April 15, there was a public meeting at the Community Center. No RCPG and T&T members were there. She learned 3 points from the meeting. Dye Rd. and Hwy 67 is a problem. Afternoon traffic is horrendous. There are problems with congestion and speed. Vacant land will be used to modify the curves. Ms. Myers said that a comprehensive plan needs to be displayed at the meetings, not individual project segments.

Mr. Piva said it would be good to see the total project. He believes the alignment for the South Bypass is Keyes to Amigos to Hwy 78. Ramona has been looking at a South and North Bypass for years. The County is addressing the top 10 Capital Improvement Projects.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley remembers voting at least once before on this stretch of road. She used to support this alignment. Now she feels this improvement will be a bandaid on a gaping wound. She is concerned with how the road will tie back into Hwy 67. It will cost a lot of money to straighten the curves. She has concerns with the next section.

Mr. Sprong looked at the whole map of the South Bypass. This segment seems the most viable – this and Dye St. to help out the SDCE.

Mr. Brean is concerned with the San Vicente portion.

Mr. Tomlinson said the design is dangerous and will encourage crashes. People will speed. It looks like a race track.

Mr. Hogervorst said the road is not safe now. He grew up on that corner.

The Chair said 1/3 of the population of Ramona is in the SDCE.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED WITH COMMENTS.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 11-2-1-0-1**, with Katherine L. Finley and Richard Tomlinson voting no, Kristi Mansolf abstaining, and Matt Deskovick absent.

13-H-5:GP Update, Ramona Community Plan Document. Staff Recommendations and Policies, Circulation and Mobility (w/GP Update, AHOPE, and Parks) – To be looked at next month.

13-I: DESIGN REVIEW (Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

Ms. Anderson will give the report at the June RCPG meeting.

13-J: TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE (Brean, Stykel) Update on Town Center Committee Meetings – Report to RCPG.

The Committee discussed the Ramona Retail Center/Target store and location.

ITEM 14: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)
A. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)
B. Agenda Requests

The Chair announced that Joel Anderson is working to repeal the very restrictive septic ordinance that recently went into effect with AB 268. He supports the rural areas.

The Chair said the RCPG visionary statement, logo and attire will be on the next agenda.

C. Concerns of Members – None

ITEM 15: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf